



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,897	06/20/2003	Scott W. Ziegler	020P0101	6794
7590 05/11/2005			EXAMINER	
Rodney F. Brown			VU, STEPHEN A	
3365 Baltimore Street San Diego, CA 92117			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Jun 20080, Oli 9211,			3636	
			DATE MAILED: 05/11/2009	ς.

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Examiner-Initiated Interview Sumn	10/600,897	ZIEGLER, SCOTT W.	
and the second s	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen A Vu	3636	
All Participants:	Status of Application: Response Received		
(1) <u>Stephen A Vu</u> .	(3)		
(2) Rodney Brown (#30,450).	(4)		
Date of Interview: 9 May 2005	Time: <u>11:08 am</u>		
	☐ Applicant's representative) No		
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed:			
Claims discussed: 1-8,10-13,15-20, and 25-27			
Prior art documents discussed: n/a			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING TO See Continuation Sheet	HE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	TWAS DISCUSSED:	
Part III.			
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a directly resulted in the allowance of the applic of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief 	cation. The examiner will provide a separate record of the substance	written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview	
	•		
	•		
Sterke - Va			
(Examiner/SPE Signature)	(Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner notified the applicant's attorney that the applicant's Request for Consideration has been received. The examiner will conduct an updated search. If the examiner issues another prior art rejection with regards to the claims, the Office action would be considered to be Non-final.